

Appl. No.: 10/037,849
Atty. Docket No. CM2464
Amdt. dated May 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action of 03/09/2004
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 11 - 14; and 24 - 33 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 1-10 and 15-23 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 11-14 have been amended to direct the compositions to a method of dry-wrinkle resisting clothing. Support for this amendment is found *inter alia* at page 3, lines 5-9 of the specification.

In addition, new Claims 24 - 25, and 31- 32 have been added. Support for this amendment is found *inter alia* at page 10, lines 4-5 of the specification.

New Claims 27 - 30 have been added. Support for this amendment is found *inter alia* original claims 11-15 and page 3, lines 8-9 of the specification

New Claim 26 and 33 has been added. Support for this amendment is found *inter alia* at page 10, lines 4-5 of the specification.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Election/Restriction

The Office Action Restricts the application into one of two groups under 35 USC 121. Applicants hereby elect Group II, directed to claims 11-23, WITHOUT traverse. As such, Applicants cancel *inter alia* claims 1-10 without prejudice.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102/103

The Office Action rejects the claims under 35 USC 102(b) and/or 103(a) in view of U.S. Pat. Nos. 4,008,196; 5,695,677; 6,001,343; WO 96/15309; and WO 00/58428. Applicants overcome the rejection by amending the claims such that the compositions are directed to a method of dry-wrinkle resisting clothing. Applicants point out that "dry wrinkle resistance," means "the resistance to the formation of wrinkles when fabrics are dry, waiting to be worn, and while fabrics are being worn." The term "dry wrinkle resistance" should be distinguished from *dewrinkling*. See page 5, lines 6-15 of the specification.

Page 4 of 5

Appl. No.: 10/037,849
Atty. Docket No. CM2464
Amdt. dated May 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action of 03/09/2004
Customer No. 27752

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 11 – 14; and 24 – 33.

Respectfully submitted,
Markus Wilhelm Altmann et al.,

By David V. Upite

David V. Upite
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 47,147
(513) 627-8150

May 19, 2004
Customer No. 27752